

REMARKS

Consideration of the above identified application in view of the following remarks is respectfully requested. Claim 41 is pending in this application. By this amendment, Claims 1-5, 7-21, 23-32, 35, 37-40 and 42-67 have been cancelled without prejudice.

In the outstanding Office Action, a restriction was imposed. The applicant hereby elects group I for prosecution on the merits.

In the Office Action, several informalities were noted under 35 U.S.C. § 112. In view of the amendments above, most of the informalities are believed to be addressed and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested. In regard to the only presently pending claim, Claim 41, ample support can be found in the application in Figure 7 and the associated description at page 5, lines 14-28; page 12, line 26 through page 13, line 5; and page 16, line 25 through page 17, line 21. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112 is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 41 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,014,650 to Zampese.

Zampese discloses a secure purchase management method. The method establishes an account for the purchaser and an associated series of secret transaction codes 32-37. The series of secret codes 32-37 is provided to the purchaser by traditional mail or in person but never by automatic means such as the Internet (see col. 3, lines 41-45). The secret codes 32-37 are generated by a random number generator (see col. 3, lines 49-51). The method uses a match between a secret code 32-37 and a corresponding code held with the account manager 22. After a match occurs and the transaction is approved,

the sent secret code and corresponding code are both deleted (see col. 4, lines 25-28). In this way, Zampese insures that each transaction occurs with "a transaction code which has not been used before" (see Abstract; col. 4, lines 1-2; col. 4, lines 13-20). By this quoted phrase, Zampese clearly means that the series of secret codes 32-37 are used sequentially rather than over and over like the traditional PIN number described in the background. In the invention of Zampese, the random number generator certainly can output the same code a plurality of times. Nothing in Zampese contemplates addressing this concern of the random number generator producing replacement codes that have been used before let alone preventing it. Thus, the same secret code are utilized more than once for the same purchaser in the invention of Zampese.


In contrast, amended Claim 41 recites a code based door opening apparatus wherein each code is unique and used only once. Moreover, a portion that is inaccessible to the user controls access to a safe room and stores the codes as well. To gain access, the proper unused code must be received from second means in possession of the user. The portion does not run out of codes because they may be automatically refreshed prior to depletion. Zampese does not disclose or suggest such a structural configuration because Zampese is not related to the field of door opening apparatus. Further, for the sake of argument, Zampese merely uses a single code. Accordingly, Claim 41 distinguishes the subject invention from Zampese. Therefore, withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

Any additional fees or overpayments due as a result of filing the present paper may be applied to Deposit Account No. 04-1105. It is respectfully submitted that Claim 41 is in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited.

If after reviewing this amendment, the Examiner believes that a telephone interview would facilitate the resolution of any remaining matters the undersigned attorney may be contacted at the number set forth herein below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 28, 2004


George N. Chaclas, Reg. No. 46,608
Edwards & Angell LLP
Attorney for Applicant
P.O. Box 9169
Boston, MA 02209-9169
Tel: (860) 541-7720
Fax: (888) 325-1684